


<b>Search Notes</b>  	<b>Application/Control No.</b>  10689556	<b>Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination</b>  ENGLER, DAWSON RICHARDS
	<b>Examiner</b>  MICHAEL B HOLMES	<b>Art Unit</b>  2129

SEARCHED			
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner
706	47	7/24/2007	MJB
706	all	11/01/2008	MBH

SEARCH NOTES		
Search Notes	Date	Examiner
Inventor Search - Google, IEEE, ACM, EAST	7/24/2007	MJB
EAST - statistical, statistics, debugging, debugger, rules, code, ratio	7/24/2007	MJB
IEEE - statistical debugger	7/24/2007	MJB
Google - statistical ~debugger	7/24/2007	MJB
Google - observation count, code, debugger, statistical, allowance, allowed, disallowed	3/5/2008	MJB
IEEE - debug, statistical, compiler, code, allowance, allowed, disallowed	3/5/2008	MJB
CiteSeer - debug, compiler, statistical, allowance	3/5/2008	MJB
Spoke with Bert Starks, who said he had not seen anything like the claims, and referred me to speak with Todd Ingberg for further search	3/5/2008	MJB
Spoke with Todd Ingberg, who directed me towards references of 'software quality metrics'. The software quality metrics use a ratio of "bugs/total lines of code" or bugs/kloc. However I was unable to find the claimed material, "bugs/observances".	3/5/2008	MJB
Google - software quality metrics, kloc, quality metrics	3/14/2008	MJB
Emailed Kakahli a copy of the claims, to find out of these would be acceptable under 101	7/1/2008	MB
Received an email from Todd Swan about the 101 which said that since all steps appear to be performed by a processor, the claims are properly tied, and article of manufacture looks statutory as long as the storage medium isn't non-statutory in the spec. If any element has to be hardware, then a rejection of software per se is unreasonable and the claims would be statutory.	7/10/2008	MB
WEST/all	11/01/2008	MBH

INTERFERENCE SEARCH			
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner
706	47	11/01/2008	MBH

--	--